

Matt said the result of the vote is 6 - yes and 1 - no and said the standard for a vote on changing the CMP document is a unanimous vote, and because this vote was not unanimous, the changes will not be incorporated into the CMP. Matt said that he would provide notification of the vote disposition. Matt asked if there were any questions. No questions were asked.

CMP Meeting
08-20-03

White-Qwest provided an overview of the CR.

Notarianni-Qwest stated that the CLECs had provided redlining by inserting comments into the Qwest proposed language, rather than actually redlining the language. She stated that Qwest could adopt that style of inserting comments if the CLECs liked. She continued that the original MCI proposal contained four severity levels and associated timeframes for remedy. She stated that Qwest felt that the fixed timeframes were not workable and did not account for the fact that each different problem required a different level and length of effort to evaluate and solve. She stated that Qwest was committed to working expeditiously to meet the timeframes as much as is possible, but she could not commit Qwest to working too quickly in an effort to meet an arbitrary timeframe unrelated to the complexity of the issue. She explained that this course could too easily lead to errors. She continued by stating that the CLEC response contained no flexibility that would allow Qwest to adequately meet problems with varying scope and complexity. She stated that Qwest was willing to readdress the validation timeframe as long as the CLECs were willing to grant Qwest some flexibility and outline what that flexibility would look like. If this was the case, she recommended another ad hoc meeting. She explained that if the CLECs were unwilling to incorporate more flexibility into the language then Qwest was prepared to vote on the change as MCI had submitted it.

Balvin-MCI stated that the CLECs are 100% impacted by interface flaws. She stated that the CLECs worked hard to propose timeframes that attempted to accommodate Qwest's needs but, without constraints, Qwest is not guaranteeing anything in its software.

Johnson-Eschelon discussed the LR form issue. She stated that this was a good illustration of why this defect language was needed. She stated that Qwest had done a very poor job of keeping her informed of the status of this fix. She stated that if Qwest was going to deny this request, she wanted it to deny it soon, so the CLECs could escalate.

Balvin-MCI stated that she was prepared to vote. She stated that the situation was at an impasse. She stated that Qwest wanted an out at every level. To illustrate her point, she read from the Qwest proposed language:

Information Current as of: Friday, September 26, 2003

Page 990 of 1340

CR # PC041503-1CM

Note: There is supplemental information pertaining to this CR. A copy of the supplemental information immediately follows the report for this CR. timetime

Report Name: 93 rptOpenDetailed_ProdProcARCHIVE

Severity Level 2 Production Defect

Qwest will either:

- ? Fix this trouble within 10 business days, or
- ? Issue an event notification, within 10 business days, announcing a date by which the trouble is scheduled to be fixed, or
- ? Issue an event notification, within 10 business days, announcing a date by which Qwest will announce a date by which the trouble is scheduled to be fixed.

Balvin-MCI stated that this language allows Qwest 30 business days, which is unacceptable.

Osborne-Miller-AT&T stated that she concurred.

Notarianni-Qwest stated that Qwest was prepared to vote. She stated that Qwest did not want an out at every level; instead, Qwest took severity levels seriously and scheduled fixes as expeditiously as possible. She stated that Qwest has provided updates to the LR form issue in the form of Event Notifications with patch dates. She stated that the current production support process is working as it was designed. She explained that Qwest had proposed language that afforded it an opportunity to address problems of various complexity and scope. She stated that Qwest does not want to be in a position to throw software out just to meet a date; instead, Qwest wants to fix problems the right way.

Balvin-MCI stated that she would like Qwest's position in writing. She stated that the CLECs would seek arbitration.

Notarianni-Qwest stated that she had already provided her position both in writing and in the minutes of this call.

Johnson-Eschelon asked that the team just vote on a document so the CLECs could escalate.

Balvin-MCI suggested that the team vote on the original MCI proposal.

White-Qwest pointed out that the original proposal was missing discussion of the validation period, that was central to the Bellsouth process, and the proposed language still contained a reference to Bellsouth.

Balvin-MCI asked that White replace all occurrences of "Bellsouth" with "Qwest."

White-Qwest stated that the vote would probably be on 8/29.

Information Current as of: Friday, September 26, 2003

Page 991 of 1340

CR # PC041503-1CM

Note: There is supplemental information pertaining to this CR. A copy of the supplemental information immediately follows the report for this CR. starttime

Report Name: 93 rptOpenDetailed_ProdProcARCHIVE

=====

August 4, 2003

Announcement Date: August 4, 2003

Effective Date: Immediately

Notification Number: CMPR.08.04.03.F.01540.RequestforResponse

Notification Category: Change Management Notification

Target Audience: CLECs, Resellers

Subject: CMP - REQUEST FOR QWEST WRITTEN RESPONSE PC041503-1CM

Associated CR # or System Name

and Number: MCI CR# PC041503-1CM

The purpose of this notification is to provide additional information on MCI CR# PC041503-1CM. A call was held July 29, 2003 to discuss the MCI originated request to add Defect Language to the CMP Document. Several participants at the July 29, 2003, ad hoc meeting requested that Qwest provide the written position on the proposed language.

Per MCI's request during the meeting, below is Qwest written response indicating our concern with the CLEC request for 'Defect' language requiring resolution of all severity levels by certain timeframes.

As was stated in the ad hoc meeting, Qwest does not believe that a fixed timeframe commitment for the severity levels, particularly the timeframes proposed by the joint CLEC community is practicable.

Not all software issues are of the same magnitude and level of complexity. While a particular issue may involve a simple software fix, there are times when the production support team must go through an extensive development cycle to get a fix implemented, and/or may require that fixes be coordinated between multiple systems. In such cases and possibly for other reasons, Qwest would not

Information Current as of: Friday, September 26, 2003

Page 992 of 1340

CR # PC041503-1CM

Note: There is supplemental information pertaining to this CR. A copy of the supplemental information immediately follows the report for this CR. timetime

Report Name: 93 rptOpenDetailed_ProdProcARCHIVE

necessarily
be able to meet the fixed timeframe.

Qwest's initial proposal back to the CLECs achieves not only flexibility to handle difficult issues in a responsible way, but also will make Qwest accountable to set forth timeframes.

Qwest understands that some CLECs disagree with this language. Qwest would continue to ask that the joint CLEC community provide a red-line version of the language that they believe would accomplish their objectives and provide Qwest the flexibility necessary to adequately address problems when they arise.

CR PC041503-1CM is contained in the Product Process Interactive Report posted to the Qwest Web site at <http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/cmp/changerequest.html>.

If you have any questions or comments about this notification, please contact Linda Sanchez-Steinke, Qwest CRPM Manager, at linda.sanchez-steinke@qwest.com or 303-965-0972.

Sincerely,

Qwest

Fri 8/1/03 5:02 PM

From: Linda Sanchez-Steinke

To: jberard@covad.com, phyllis.burt@att.com, stephanie.prull@mcleodusa.com, jennifer.arnold@uslink.com; bjjohnson@eschelon.com

All,

The following is Qwest's response to MCI's Defect Language:

A call was held July 29, 2003 to discuss the MCI originated request to add Defect Language to the CMP Document. Per MCI's request during the meeting, below is Qwest written response indicating our concern with the CLEC request for 'Defect'

Information Current as of: Friday, September 26, 2003

Page 993 of 1340

CR # PC041503-1CM

Note: There is supplemental information pertaining to this CR. A copy of the supplemental information immediately follows the report for this CR. timetime

Report Name: 93 rptOpenDetailed_ProdProcARCHIVE

language requiring resolution of all severity levels by certain timeframes.

As was stated in the ad hoc meeting, Qwest does not believe that a fixed timeframe commitment for the severity levels, particularly the timeframes proposed by the joint CLEC community is practicable.

Not all software issues are of the same magnitude and level of complexity. While a particular issue may involve a simple software fix, there are times when the production support team must go through an extensive development cycle to get a fix implemented, and/or may require that fixes be coordinated between multiple systems. In such cases and possibly for other reasons, Qwest would not necessarily be able to meet the fixed timeframe.

Qwest's initial proposal back to the CLECs achieves not only flexibility to handle difficult issues in a responsible way, but also will make Qwest accountable to set forth timeframes.

Qwest understands that some CLECs disagree with this language. Qwest would continue to ask that the joint CLEC community provide a red-line version of the language that they believe would accomplish their objectives and provide Qwest the flexibility necessary to adequately address problems when they arise.

If you have any questions, please call me.

Thank you

Linda Sanchez-Steinke
CRPM
Qwest
303-965-0972

Ad Hoc
Meeting Minutes
PC041503-1CM
July 29, 2003
1-877-550-8686, Conference ID 221337#
10:00 a.m. - 10:30 a.m. Mountain Time

PURPOSE

Information Current as of: Friday, September 26, 2003

Page 994 of 1340

CR # PC041503-1CM

Note: There is supplemental information pertaining to this CR. A copy of the supplemental information immediately follows the report for this CR. timeline

Report Name: 93 rptOpenDetailed_ProdProcARCHIVE

At the July 8, 2003 Ad Hoc CMP Meeting for PC041503-1CM, participants agreed to collectively red-line the Qwest proposed language to Section 12 Production Support and hold a subsequent ad hoc conference call to discuss MCI comments to the Qwest proposed language.

The following is the write-up of the discussions, action items, and decisions made in the working session.

List of Attendees:

Liz Balvin - MCI
 John Berard - Covad
 Phyllis Burt - AT&T
 Stephanie Prull - McLeod
 Jen Arnold - U S Link
 Kim Isaacs - Eschelon
 Bonnie Johnson - Eschelon
 Lynn Notarianni - Qwest
 Connie Winston - Qwest
 Beth Foster - Qwest
 Linda Sanchez-Steinke - Qwest

MEETING MINUTES

Lynn Notarianni with Qwest said that we have received comments back on the Qwest proposed language changes to Section 12 and have reviewed the comments the CLECs included. She noted that if there was no movement in some areas, then she proposes that we have language finalized and move to the vote. She indicated that the first CLEC Comment around addressing "inoperable functionality" was discussed on the first meeting to review this CR. Lynn read from the original language of the MCI proposal and recapped: even though software user requirements and business rules match; this will be addressed as a defect. Lynn said that Qwest's original position on this is the same, that Qwest would not consider this a defect, as it would be functionality working as designed.

Liz Balvin with MCI said these types of inoperable functionality can happen and the CLECs need to have them addressed.

Lynn Notarianni with Qwest asked for further definition of "inoperable functionality". She asked the CLECs to provide proposed language to specify what the CLECs were talking about as the language provided in the original CR is too broad.

Information Current as of: Friday, September 26, 2003

Page 995 of 1340

CR # PC041503-1CM

Note: There is supplemental information pertaining to this CR. A copy of the supplemental information immediately follows the report for this CR. timetime

Report Name: 93 rptOpenDetailed_ProdProcARCHIVE

Liz Balvin with MCI said "inoperable functionality" means CLECs can't submit an LSR and can't pass orders.

Bonnie Johnson with Eschelon said it's when the CLECs can't submit an order because of an error on Qwest's side. We are talking about Eschelon not being able to submit an electronic LSR, we are talking about others can't submit electronic LSRs, and MCI can't submit an electronic LSR.

Lynn Notarianni with Qwest said that maybe Qwest didn't understand inoperable functionality as it was written in the Bell South Documentation. She reviewed the Bell South language that was originally submitted by MCI: "These problems are where the interface is not working in accordance to the user requirements or the business rules published by Qwest. In addition, if functional requirements agreed upon by Qwest and the CLECs, results in inoperable functionality, even though software user requirements and business rules match". Lynn Notarianni with Qwest noted that what she is hearing the CLECs talking about was when CLECs are unable to get an LSR into Qwest's system.

Liz Balvin with MCI and Bonnie Johnson with Eschelon agreed with Lynn Notarianni's statement.

Lynn Notarianni with Qwest said that Qwest will take a look at that.

Lynn Notarianni with Qwest noted that the second area that needs to be addressed is the timeframe for fixing 'defects' based on the severity levels. Qwest has proposed language to commit as best we could to the proposed timeframes the CLECs provided, and the proposed language also allowed for flexibility for fixing those trouble tickets that are larger in scope. The CLECs had agreed to review the language and come back with proposed changes of their own, and what the CLECs provided was their original language with no changes at all.

Liz Balvin with MCI said that the intent of the comment is that CLECs need specific timeframes for resolution and felt that Qwest didn't provide any resolution timeframes at all.

Lynn Notarianni with Qwest said that we did come back with a proposal, for example, with a Severity 2 ticket where the issue is simply an edit change, then Qwest can fix within 10 days. However, often times a ticket may involve other downstream systems and could take more than 10 days. Lynn said that she is hearing the CLECs think Qwest did not come far enough, but asked if the CLECs can move off the timeframes for resolution in the Severity Levels; 3 business days Severity Level 1, 10 business days Severity Level 2, 30 business days Severity Level 3 and 45 business days. Lynn asked if the CLECs could provide back language indicating where they would be willing to budge on proposed timeframes.

Liz Balvin with MCI said that the CLECs want proposed timeframes for fixing defects and Qwest has proposed nothing, what Qwest has proposed is a way out of every situation. Liz asked what Qwest thinks 'immediately' means. By Qwest not giving a timeframe for a fix for a system outage, CLECs are out of the water if Qwest has done something wrong.

Lynn Notarianni with Qwest said that immediately means as soon as possible. Lynn said that Severity 1 issues are not where we should be focusing this discussion. She noted that Qwest is covered with the System availability PID and asked if it would be more appropriate to have the real focus on Severity Level 2 and Severity Level 3.

Liz Balvin with MCI asked if Qwest was agreeing to a timeframe for Severity Level 1.

Lynn Notarianni with Qwest replied that she was not agreeing to a time frame, she said that Qwest is on top of Severity Level 1 and are meeting PIDS for availability of systems and it really seems like the Severity Level 2 is where impacts are.

Liz Balvin with MCI asked if Qwest will impose a time frame on Severity Level 1.

Lynn Notarianni with Qwest said that availability for systems makes Severity Level 1 a non-issue.

Liz Balvin with MCI said that if Qwest is meeting the PIDs, then it wouldn't be an issue, but she would still like Qwest to impose timeframes on the other Severity Levels.

Lynn Notarianni with Qwest said that Qwest proposed what we thought we could do and now need to know how far the CLECs can go other than the 10 days they have proposed for Severity Level 2's, allowing Qwest flexibility to determine the problem and negotiate the timeframe. Lynn noted that Qwest has provided what we truly believe can be done. She noted that Qwest is looking for language from the CLECs that proposes an alternative that they can live with.

Liz Balvin with MCI said that in situations where there is defect, it is not working as intended, Qwest built the interface and won't guarantee anything as far as a fix time. Leaving the wording open-ended leaves the CLECs out of the water.

Lynn Notarianni with Qwest said that while she was not involved in the Re-Design process, it was her understanding that the current language was put together and all parties agreed to it at that time. Now you are saying that you want tighter language. If CLECs are able to move off the fixed timeframe of days currently proposed then Qwest would be interested in seeing their proposed language. If the CLECs are not willing to move away from their originally proposed language, then it is time to finalize the language and take a vote.

Bonnie Johnson from Eschelon asked if Qwest would vote no to the originally proposed language.

Lynn Notarianni with Qwest responded that a vote of no would likely be the result if there was no change to the original language proposed by MCI.

Bonnie Johnson from Eschelon said there are significant impacts and Qwest is saying they don't care about the impact on the CLECs company.

Lynn Notarianni with Qwest stated that she would not try to dismiss Bonnie's comment as she knows that Qwest can see our internal process and we know how hard the teams work to push through the changes to get fixed. She said that she knows the CLECs cannot see our internal process and have no way of knowing how hard Qwest works internally on issues to get them to resolution.

Liz Balvin with MCI re-read the Severity Level 2 wording "will occur within 10 business days following the date upon which Qwest's defect validation process is scheduled to complete." She noted that this is talking about the time period after validation of a defect.

Lynn said that sometimes we have to go through the lifecycle and re-write and validate in the business rules and it is likely that the process will take more than 10 days. She noted that there are times when the production support team must go through an entire development cycle to get a fix implemented, impacting and coordinating multiple systems, and in cases like that there would be no way for Qwest to meet the timeframes put forth by the CLECs in their original proposal.

Connie Winston said that when problems impact the front end systems like IMA, it could be due to day to day impacts and be easy to quickly back out the problem and always focus on the front end. If the problem is in the billing systems sometimes we have to dig deeper and determine a good time to make changes and that is where we struggle with the 10 business days.

Bonnie Johnson with Eschelon said the CLECs need to discuss this further as a community.

Liz Balvin with MCI said that she doesn't see Qwest making any movement toward the CLEC proposal.

Bonnie Johnson with Eschelon agreed with Liz Balvin and mentioned the problems with hunting, needing to submit another CR, and having to wait for 2 releases in order to get a fix for it.

Liz Balvin with MCI said Qwest is proposing no guarantees to CLECs on the software they provide to the CLECs but instead is

Information Current as of: Friday, September 26, 2003

Page 998 of 1340

CR # PC041503-1CM

Note: There is supplemental information pertaining to this CR. A copy of the supplemental information immediately follows the report for this CR. **timetime**

Report Name: 93 rptOpenDetailed_ProdProcARCHIVE

providing themselves a way out.

Lynn Notarianni with Qwest said that Qwest did make a proposal back to CLECs and if there is a different way to meet the CLECs needs, Qwest would be happy to review it. If the CLECS could come with a proposal that you think you can live with, Qwest would review it. Lynn also said there are other areas in the proposed language that Qwest would like to discuss, but unless we can get past the larger issues then there seems to be no need to discuss those areas.

Liz Balvin with MCI asked that Qwest provide their written position to the CLEC comments as discussed on this call. She noted that the CLECs position is that Qwest needs to commit that they will guarantee the software they provide and right now Qwest is guaranteeing nothing.

Lynn Notarianni with Qwest said Qwest would provide their response to the CLEC comments by the end of the week.

Linda Sanchez-Steinke with Qwest asked if there were any additional comments. No comments were made.

July 8, 2003 - CMP Ad Hoc Meeting PC041503-1CM

Attendees

Matt White - Qwest
 Lynn Notarianni - Qwest
 Beth Foster - Qwest
 Kit Thornte - Qwest
 Connie Winston - Qwest
 Liz Balvin - MCI
 Kim Isaacs - Eschelon
 Bonnie Johnson - Eschelon
 Donna Osborne-Miller - AT&T
 Sharon Van Meter - AT&T
 Carla Pardee - AT&T
 Mike Zulevic - Covad
 Lori Mendoza - Allegiance

Balvin-MCI asked Qwest to describe the proposed language. White-Qwest described the process Qwest used to create the

Information Current as of: Friday, September 26, 2003

Page 999 of 1340

CR # PC041503-1CM

Note: There is supplemental information pertaining to this CR. A copy of the supplemental information immediately follows the report for this CR. timetime

Report Name: 93 rptOpenDetailed_ProdProcARCHIVE

proposed language. Notarianni-Qwest stated that Qwest tried to maintain the intent of the existing Production Support language while outlining these additional activities. She stated that this language also addresses the unpredictability of defects. She stated that Qwest focused on Severity 2 and Severity 3 troubles because Severity 1 troubles already have an effective process and Severity 4 troubles are essentially enhancements.

Balvin-MCI stated that the proposed warrantee period was too short for both GUI and EDI migrations. Notarianni-Qwest stated that the most efficient manner of conveying the CLEC's issues might be to redline the Qwest proposed language. Balvin-MCI agreed.

Balvin-MCI stated that Qwest's language did not address documentation flaws. She stated that these occur when Qwest changes language to more accurately reflect the way a system is really working. She also explained that she felt the proposed language was appropriately placed in Section 12.0, but that it placed too much burden on the CLECs to identify problems and validate that the trouble was a defect. She continued that she was not satisfied that the Qwest internal validation period was not bounded by a time constraint and that there is no discussion of how soon Qwest must request additional information from the CLECs.

Johnson-Eschelon stated that the warrantee period was too short for EDI and GUI users. She stated that the language also did not address issues like those faced in Hunting discussion. She explained that this was when the documentation agreed with the system, but that the system was not changed in such a manner that addressed the accepted CR. Notarianni-Qwest stated that there would be an edit for alpha and the system was working as written, but it broke the business. The issue is if it's documented a certain way, and it's acting the way it's been documented, but it is not functional. Balvin-MCI added that it is also an issue if the change request was not implemented as requested, and provided Migrate as Specified as an example. Notarianni-Qwest asked if this was an issue for a defect discussion, or a question of how explicit CR descriptions and clarification calls must be. She asked if we need to get into more detail in clarification calls to make sure everyone is on the same page. She noted that there seems to be more of an issue of being more specific in the detail of the CRs. She stated that this are would be more difficult to get agreement on as far as getting the language written and agreed to. She indicated again that it would be most beneficial if the CLECs would take the language and provide their red-lines to provide their thoughts on how to make this work.

Balvin-MCI stated that each of the severity level descriptions in the proposed language gave Qwest an "out." She stated that this language did not require an appropriate level of urgency. She stated that CLECs wanted immediate results and dates that Qwest would repair the defect. Notarianni-Qwest stated that this language was proposed because not all trouble tickets are similar; some require extensive checking through downstream systems, checking that cannot be done in such a short period of time. She added that Qwest would not want to agree to a timeline and then not be able to meet it. Osbourne-Miller-AT&T

Information Current as of: Friday, September 26, 2003

Page 1000 of 1340

CR # PC041503-1CM

Note: There is supplemental information pertaining to this CR. A copy of the supplemental information immediately follows the report for this CR. *timetime*

Report Name: 93 rptOpenDetailed_ProdProcARCHIVE

agreed with Balvin that the CELCs need definitive dates for fixing defects. Balvin-MCI stated that Bellsouth's language did not include escape language like Qwest's. She stated that this language needed to focus more on identifying the root cause of the trouble. She noted that longer timeframes for analysis could be looked at, but once the cause is identified, the CLECs should get an implementation date immediately. Notarianni-Qwest stated that she was not aware of how Bellsouth structured their efforts to comply with their obligations. Balvin-MCI stated that the language was too open-ended. She stated that the second to the last paragraph was also inappropriate because it inferred that Qwest would punish the CLECs for Qwest's mistake. Notarianni-Qwest stated that Qwest added that paragraph because there could be situations where Qwest had to divert specialized resources to meet defect obligations. She added that this was also part of the reason that Qwest included the warrantee language, in order to assure that we don't impact later cycle development efforts for the next version of the release

Balvin-MCI stated that she would like to provide redline comments. She stated that this language provided Qwest too many outs. She stated that she appreciated Qwest's effort to prepare this language and that it was far more than she had expected. Notarianni-Qwest stated that she wanted to address Balvin's point about the CLECs having to prove that the issue was a defect. She stated that Qwest's intent was not to force the CLECs to prove defect status, but to ensure that Qwest had all possible information on what was being impacted to make the determination during the internal validation.

The group discussed how to proceed and agreed that the CLECs would collectively redline the proposed language and send it to White-Qwest. He would then issue a notification for a subsequent Ad Hoc Meeting. The meeting was adjourned.

=====

CMP Meeting
06-18-03

White-Qwest gave a status of the CR. He stated that the Ad Hoc meeting would be held on 7/8.

=====

Ad Hoc Meeting - 06-10-03

Attendees
Matt White - Qwest
Beth Foster - Qwest
Lynn Notarianni - Qwest
Sharon Van Meter - AT&T

Information Current as of: Friday, September 26, 2003

Page 1001 of 1340

CR # PC041503-1CM

Note: There is supplemental information pertaining to this CR. A copy of the supplemental information immediately follows the report for this CR. timetime

Report Name: 93 rptOpenDetailed_ProdProcARCHIVE

Donna Osborne Miller - AT&T
 Carla Pardee - AT&T
 Liz Balvin - MCI
 Lori Mendoza - Allegiance
 Kim Isaacs - Eschelon
 Bonnie Johnson - Eschelon

White-Qwest reviewed the purpose of the meeting and asked Balvin-MCI to review the purpose of the CR. Balvin-MCI reviewed the CR. She stated that it was an attempt to refine the process for what happens when something doesn't work. She stated that if there is an identified problem, then Qwest should have to fix in a certain period of time. She stated that the Bellsouth process was more clearly defined than the Qwest CMP. White-Qwest asked how Bellsouth handled the "internal validation" process described in their CCP document and how they interpreted the "inoperable functionality" description. Balvin-MCI stated that this constitutes a system that is so flawed that there is no functionality. Notarianni-Qwest asked if that was similar to a Qwest CMP Production Support Level 1. Balvin-MCI stated that was correct. She continued that when a CLEC submits a CR to Bellsouth, Bellsouth validates that it is a defect. She stated that if Bellsouth does not agree that the CR is a defect, there is some give and take. She stated that there needs to be language in the Qwest CMP outlining a process to quickly fix defects.

Johnson-Eschelon stated that she had examples of what constituted defects. She described a situation involving hunting problems waiting to be fixed until the next release and a blocking work around that was a temporary fix to a system defect. She stated that there needs to be a clearer definition of when something is system defect vs. not. Notarianni-Qwest asked if these would be Level 2's in Bellsouth's language. Johnson-Eschelon stated that they would. Notarianni-Qwest asked how the CLECs would approach changes that occurred as a result of defects and that also caused development changes. She stated that these could constitute code impacting changes and that they could impact other CLECs as well as disrupt the development cycle. Balvin-MCI stated that there were really two kinds of defects. (1) When the system was not operating the way the business rules stated it should be and (2) when the system was operating in the way Qwest designed it, but the business rules were written in a way that caused the CLECs to code differently. She stated that the latter instance would be the one that caused CLECs development difficulty. Notarianni-Qwest asked if CLECs would want a short resolution timeframe for the former and a longer timeframe for the latter. Balvin-MCI agreed. Notarianni-Qwest asked if the CLECs could provide Qwest with examples of each defect severity from the other ILECs. She stated that Qwest's attempts to get this information from Bellsouth had not been very successful. She stated that Qwest would like to understand how Bellsouth is implementing this and managing it without upending the current processes and lifecycles of development. Balvin-MCI agreed to look at providing some examples. Johnson-Eschelon stated that she would like Qwest to propose language that would work using the two examples she provided. Notarianni-Qwest stated that she was not familiar with the Hunting issue. She stated that the

Information Current as of: Friday, September 26, 2003

Page 1002 of 1340

CR # PC041503-1CM

Note: There is supplemental information pertaining to this CR. A copy of the supplemental information immediately follows the report for this CR. timetime

Report Name: 93 rptOpenDetailed_ProdProcARCHIVE

bottom line is that these types of changes will drain development resources and pull resources away from the development work required for major releases. She continued that the conclusion the team needed to arrive at was when these changes should impact other CLECs and when they should not. She asked if it was more important to the CLECs to establish a consistent timeframe for each problem, or that Qwest issue a negotiable commitment after uncovering the root of a problem. She stated that she was trying to avoid situations where there could be disagreements about an issue's treatment. Balvin-MCI stated that she would be amenable to a range of days. She stated that the CLECs would want a 'no later than' date for fixes. She asked Qwest to propose language. Notarianni-Qwest stated that she would take that request back internally and discuss it further with the team. She reiterated that Qwest would like the CLECs to send some examples (of both Qwest issues and ILEC issues). She stated that Qwest must also consider a number of parts of the CMP document that such changes may impact. She stated that she would ask internally if Qwest was willing to commit to timeframes for fixing production issues and, if so, what timeframes Qwest could commit to. The team agreed that Qwest would issue proposed language with an Ad Hoc Meeting Notification on July 1, and that the Ad Hoc Meeting would occur on July 8. Balvin-MCI asked that if Qwest was ultimately going to deny this request, they indicate that intent as soon as possible. Notarianni-Qwest stated that would be her expectation, should that be the case.

=====

05-21-03 CMP Meeting

Balvin-MCI presented the CR. White-Qwest stated that he would schedule an Ad Hoc Meeting. Balvin-MCI stated that the CLECs would like to see the Qwest proposed language before the meeting. She asked that the meeting be on 6/9 or 6/10.

**MCI Proposed Addition to CMP Section 4.0 -- Production
Support, submitted to CMP April 15, 2003**

MCI PROPOSED CHANGE – 04-15-03

4.0 TYPES OF CHANGE

A Change Request must be within the scope of CMP and will fall into one of the following classifications. Types of Changes apply to Systems and Product/Process.

4.1 Regulatory Change

A Regulatory Change is mandated by regulatory or legal entities, such as the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), a state commission/authority, or state and federal courts. Regulatory changes are not voluntary but are requisite to comply with newly passed legislation, regulatory requirements, or court rulings. Either the CLEC or Qwest may originate the Change Request.

4.2 Industry Guideline Change

An Industry Guideline Change implements Industry Guidelines. Either Qwest or the CLEC may originate the Change Request and these changes are subject to the same processes under this CMP as Qwest and CLEC Originated Changes. These industry guidelines are defined by:

- Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions (ATIS) sponsored
- Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF)
- Local Service Ordering and Provisioning Committee (LSOP)
- Telecommunications Industry Forum (TCIF)
- Electronic Commerce Inter-exchange Committee (ECIC)
- Electronic Data Interchange Committee (EDI)
- American National Standards Institute (ANSI)

4.3 Qwest Originated Change

A Qwest Originated Change is originated by Qwest and does not fall within the changes listed above.

4.4 CLEC Originated Change

A CLEC Originated Change is originated by the CLEC and does not fall within the changes listed above.

4.5 CLEC Impacting Defect

Defect requests would be changes that correct problems discovered in production versions of an interface. These problems are where the interface is not working in accordance to the user requirements or the business rules published by Qwest. In addition, if functional requirements agreed upon by Qwest and the CLECs, results in inoperable functionality, even though software user requirements and business rules match; this will be addressed as a defect.

These problems typically affect the CLEC's ability to exchange transactions with Qwest and may include documentation that is in error, has missing information or is unclear in nature. Defined severity levels and time frames for corrective action would be as follows:

- Severity 1 – Critical – Problem results in a complete system outage and/or is detrimental to the majority of the development and/or testing efforts. Correction of Severity 1 defects will occur within 3 days.
- Severity 2 – Serious – System functionality is degraded with serious adverse impact to the users and there is not an effective work-around. Correction of Severity 2 defects will occur within 10 business days following the date upon which Qwest's defect validation process is scheduled to complete.
- Severity 3 – Moderate – System functionality is degraded with a moderate adverse impact to the users but there is an effective workaround. Correction of Severity 3 defects will occur within 30 business days following the date upon which Qwest's defect validation process is scheduled to complete.
- Severity 4 – Cosmetic – There is no immediate adverse impact to the users. Correction of Severity 4 defects will occur within 45 business days following the date upon which BellSouth's defect validation process is scheduled to complete. The CLEC and/or Qwest may initiate these types of changes affecting interfaces between the CLEC's and Qwest's operational support systems.

Detailed steps, accountable individuals, tasks, inputs/outputs and cycle times of each sub-process in the CLEC impacting defect type CR must be negotiated. This process will be used to validate defects, provide status notification(s), workarounds and final resolution to the CLEC community.

Qwest Proposed Addition to CMP Section 12.0 –
Production Support, submitted to CMP June 30, 2003

**Proposed addition to Section 12.0 – Production Support
(Insert following Section 12.7)**

Production Defects

Production Defects are Severity Level 2 or Severity Level 3 troubles, as defined in Section 12.5, and occur when a system is not operating in the manner the published business rules state it should be.

Qwest or a CLEC may submit a Production Defect issue using an IT Trouble Ticket as described in Section 12.3. When originating the ticket, the originator must:

- Identify that the originator considers the issue that prompted the ticket to be a Production Defect, as described above;
- Provide Qwest with all available examples of what function the defect prevents the submitter from performing.

Qwest will not begin the internal validation period without sufficient documentation, as determined by Qwest. If an originator does not include sufficient information for Qwest to complete an internal validation, Qwest will contact the originator and request additional documentation.

Warranty Period

If Qwest or a CLEC wishes to submit a Production Defect issue it must do so no later than 30 calendar days after the release production date of the release containing the defect. All issues identified after this time must be submitted as a standard IT Trouble Ticket or a CMP Change Request.

Qwest Internal Validation

Upon receiving an appropriately supported defect ticket, Qwest will conduct an internal validation to determine (1) that the issue constitutes a defect and (2) the appropriate Severity Level for the ticket.

If Qwest disagrees with the categorization of the issue as a defect, Qwest will notify the originator and recommend the appropriate manner to pursue the issue. If the originator does not agree with the results of the Qwest internal validation, the originator may follow the Technical Escalation Process.

If Qwest validates the ticket's categorization as a defect and assigns a Severity Level 2 or Severity Level 3, Qwest will adhere to the timelines described below. These timelines will begin following the date upon which Qwest's defect validation process is completed.

Severity Level 2 Production Defect

Qwest will either:

- Fix this trouble within 10 business days, or
- Issue an event notification, within 10 business days, announcing a date by which the trouble is scheduled to be fixed, or
- Issue an event notification, within 10 business days, announcing a date by which Qwest will announce a date by which the trouble is scheduled to be fixed.

Severity Level 3 Production Defect

Qwest will either:

- Fix this trouble within 30 business days, or
- Issue an event notification, within 15 business days, announcing a date by which the trouble is scheduled to be fixed, or
- Issue an event notification, within 15 business days, announcing a date by which Qwest will announce a date by which the trouble is scheduled to be fixed.

Qwest will notify the CMP community if the correction of any defect requires diversion of resources designated for the next major release.

At any time during this process, a CLEC or Qwest may elect to submit the issue as a standard IT Trouble Ticket in accordance with Section 12.0.

October 14, 2003, CMP Ad Hoc Meeting Agenda



Wholesale Process and System Review & Proposal Summary